

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10 and 14-33 are pending in the current application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 14, 17, and 20-23 are amended. By this Amendment, no claims are added or cancelled. Claims 1, 14, 17, and 20-23 are the independent claims.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the telephone interview conducted on August 12, 2009. In accordance with our discussion, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, “the video data in each interleaving unit being divided into ~~one or more~~ entry points.” (Emphasis Added). As agreed to by the Examiner, the above-identified amendments to claim 1 overcome Sawabe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,962, hereinafter “Sawabe”). In addition, Applicants have amended the other independent claims to include features similar to the above-identified amendments to claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully request the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn. Furthermore, as stated during the interview, Applicants believe that none of the cited references disclose or suggest “the stream file, the **clip information file**, and the **playlist file** including different file extensions from one another” as recited in the independent claims.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 7-15, 17, 18, 20-24, 26, 28-30, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawabe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,962, hereinafter “Sawabe”) in view of Kikuchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,523,

hereinafter “Kikuchi”) and Tsumagari (U.S Patent No. 6,480,669). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, “the video data in each interleaving unit being divided into entry points.” The Examiner relied upon FIG. 7 of Sawabe as disclosing this feature. However, as stated above, the Examiner has acknowledged that the above-identified amendments to claim 1 overcome Sawabe. Furthermore, none of the other cited references overcome this deficiency. For instance Tsumagari fails to teach an *interleaving unit*. Because Tsumagari does not disclose or suggest an interleaving unit, Tsumagari cannot possibly disclose each interleaving unit being divided into a plurality of entry points. For reasons that are apparent, Kikuchi fails to cure this deficiency as well.

In addition, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest “the stream file, the clip information file, and the playlist file including different file extensions from one another” of claim 1. In particular, Applicants submit Tsumagari fails to disclose or suggest a playlist file having a different file extension from the clip information file, which is in contrast to claim 1. For example, referring to FIG. 5 of Tsumagari, Tsumagari teaches an RTR.IFO file. The RTR.IFO stores management information such as a program set, program, entry point, play list, and the like for managing moving picture information. Also, the respective TMAPI, cell and playlist are included **in** the RTR.IFO file such that the respective features which are indicated as corresponding features of the clip information file and/or playlist file by the Examiner, have the **same** file name extension. Furthermore, Kikuchi fails to cure this deficiency as well. For example, FIG. 6 of Kikuchi does not indicate file names. The other figures of Kikuchi (e.g., FIGS. 25 and 26) appear not to be relevant to these issues.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Sawabe, Kikuchi, and Tsumagari, fail to render independent claim 1 obvious. The other independent claims have been amended to include features similar to the above-recited features of claim 1, and therefore are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above. As such, Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 5, 16, 19, 25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawabe in view of Kikuchi and further in view of Tsumagari and Sugimoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,140, hereinafter "Sugimoto"). Claims 5, 16, 19, 25 and 27, dependent on the independent claims, are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above. As such, Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of the claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

Jared B. Scholz, Reg. No. 64,088

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

GDY/JBS:gew